



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virignia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,968		10/09/2001	Joachim Noack	02565/93	8345
26646	7590	10/03/2003		EXAMINER	
KENYON		ON	THOMPSON, KATHRYN L		
ONE BROA NEW YOR		0004		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
				3763	
				DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003	\mathcal{A}

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	C.
		09/973,968	NOACK, JOACHIM	_
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Kathryn L Thompson	3763	
·	The MAILING DATE of this communication a			
Period fo	r Reply	•		
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui - Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stateply received by the Office later than three months after the maind patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	J. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be t eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froi ute, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) 🖾	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09	9 October 2001 .	•	
2a)□		This action is non-final.		
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allo		prosecution as to the merits is	
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under			
· ·	on of Claims Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the applicati	ion		
, —	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	•		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Tawn from consideration.		
•	Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
•	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
,	on Papers			
9) 🗌 .	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
10) 🔲 .	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to by the Ex	aminer.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to			
11) 🗌	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
12) 🗌	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.	•	
•	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	•		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume			
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a l	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
14) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	e) (to a provisional applicatio	n).
)	*		
Attachmen	t(s)	<u> </u>		
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of Informa	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) al Patent Application (PTO-152)	
IS Patent and T	rademark Office			

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-5, drawn to a method for determining an intraperitoneal volume during peritoneal dialysis, classified in class 604, subclass 29.
- II. Claims 6-10, drawn to an apparatus for peritoneal dialysis, classified in class 604, subclass 19.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus such as a remotely controlled implantable device.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: (A) Figure 1; (B) Figure 3.

Application/Control Number: 09/973,968

Art Unit: 3763

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Ginsberg on January 23, 2003, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 3763

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn L Thompson whose telephone number is 703-305-3286. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM: 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

KLT

rimary Gaminer